

IACG

15 August 1980

SUBJECT: GRILL FLAME Program (U)

MG E. R. Thompson
Assistant Chief of Staff for Intelligence
HQDA
Washington, DC 20310

1. (U) References:

- a. (U) DIA Ltr S-1922/DT-1, 7 Aug 80, subject as above. (SECRET)
- b. (U) Report of the GRILL FLAME Scientific Evaluation Committee, Dec 79. (SECRET)

2. (U) Forwarded for your information at inclosure 1 are specific comments pertaining to a review of ref a proposal. Although the DIA initiative in this area is a well intentioned and long awaited one, there are several general areas of concern cited below to which your attention is invited.

3. (S/NOFORN) Whereas ref a justification for sole source procurement with SRI International may apply in the area of remote viewing technology, such justification is invalid in areas of "tracking" and physiological monitoring. So far as is known, SRI has no substantial data base regarding either "tracking" experiments or physiological monitoring. It would appear other possible contractors should be considered, some of whom may be more technically suited to accomplish these goals.

4. (S/NOFORN) The question of source of Army funding is one which must be resolved. The INSCOM GRILL FLAME Program (IGFP) operating budget for FY 81-83 stands at \$150K per year; however, the IGFP will be evaluated in July 1981 to determine program viability. It is premature under these circumstances for IGFP to be contractually committed to any three year program. It is not, however, premature for Army to so commit funds. Of FY 81 funds, approximately \$30K is to be dedicated

GRILL FLAME

~~SECRET~~ NOFORN

CLASSIFIED BY DAHJ-LSH MEG 05/6302
DECLASSIFY ON Jul 80
OR
REVIEW ON Aug 2000

SA FILE CY

IACG (15 Aug 80)
SUBJ: GRILL FLAME Program (U)

toward IGFP operations. Although the remaining funds are expected to be directed toward contractual training, by no means can IGFP allow those funds to be committed to SRI in their entirety. The IGFP must retain a high level of initiative in pursuing training/development required by remote viewing operations, and from whatever source these benefits might be derived. Under these circumstances, it is apparent that DA funding assistance for FY 81 and follow-on years will be required if ref a proposal is accepted.

5. (S/NOFORN) Ref a proposes training of two Army personnel in ORV techniques and one in "tracking" during FY 81. However, an associate of SRI having proprietary interest in development of the new ORV methods does not anticipate readiness for training for approximately one year. In view of lack of prior SRI involvement in formal "tracking" experiments, it is unlikely that a training procedure could be developed and training accomplished during FY 81. Under this proposed DLE concept, little substantive gain will be realized by Army during FY 81 with the single exception of the audio analysis portion.

6. (S/NOFORN) In view of ref b recommendations concerning cessation of contact with SRI, there appears to be a basic contradiction in the ref a proposal which may have already been considered by your office. Essentially, ref a proposes a long term period of association with SRI, and at an expanded level. Whereas INSCOM is of the position that continued contact with SRI is warranted, that contact should not be at the expense of pursuing other potential sources of training/information in the psychoenergetics field.

1 Incl
as

WILLIAM I. ROLYA
Major General, USA
Commanding

~~SECRET NOFORN~~